

### **REMARKS**

The present Amendment amends claims 2 and 5-10, cancels claims 1, 3 and 4 and adds new claims 11 and 12. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 2 and 5-12.

In the Office Action it appears that the Examiner did not consider the Information Disclosure Statement submitted along with the filing of the present application on August 31, 2001. Attached herewith a Form PTO-1449 providing a listing of such references. The Examiner is respectfully requested to indicate that such references have been considered in the forthcoming Office Action.

The Abstract stands objected to due to informalities noted by the Examiner in paragraph 2 of the Office Action. Amendments were made to the Abstract to bring it into conformity with the requirements of MPEP §608.01(b). Therefore, this objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

The drawings stand objected to as allegedly failing to comply with 37 CFR §1.84(p)(5) being that the Examiner states that the drawings include reference numerals not mentioned in the specification. Various amendments were made throughout the specification to add the reference numerals as illustrated in the drawings into the specification. Therefore, this objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Sahai (U.S. Patent No. 6,594,699); claims 2-6 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Chen (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,100); and claims 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sahai in

view of Jayant (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0028024 A1). As indicated above, claims 1, 3 and 4 were canceled. Therefore, these rejections with respect to claims 1, 3 and 4 is rendered moot.

Also, Jayant is not an appropriate reference to be used for anticipatory or obviousness type purposes to reject the claims of the present application being that the present application claims a priority date of April 2, 2001 which predates the effective date of July 11, 2001 of Jayant. Thus, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 9 and 10 fails since the asserted combination Sahai and Jayant cannot be used for obviousness type purposes to reject claims 9 and 10. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) of claims 9 and 10 as being unpatentable over Sahai in view of Jayant is respectfully requested.

With respect to the rejections of the remaining claims 2 and 5-8, Applicants traverse these rejections. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 2 and 5-8 are not taught or suggested by Sahai and Chen whether taken individually or in combination with each other or in combination with any of the other references of record. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 2, 7 and 8 as being anticipated by Sahai and the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 4-6 as being anticipated by Chen are respectfully requested.

Amendments were made to claims 2, 7 and 8 so as to more clearly recite that the present invention is directed to a multi-media conversion server, for example, as recited in claim 2 as including means for receiving media information transmitted by a first terminal, means for acquiring a destination of the media information received,

means for acquiring media decoding capability of a second terminal which is the destination, means for converting the media information into media information corresponding to the media decoding capability of the second terminal and means for transmitting the media information corresponding to the media decoding capability of the second terminal.

Further, according to the present invention as recited in claims 7 and 8, the present invention is directed to a multi-media conversion server including means for receiving video information addressed to a second terminal from a first terminal, means for acquiring video information representing a format or a screen size of video information that can be received and decoded by the second terminal using an identification of the second terminal received from the first terminal, means for comparing a video format of the received video information with the video format information representing a format of video information that can be received and decoded by the second terminal, means for, if a video format that can be received and decoded by the second terminal is not available in the received video information as a result of the comparison, selecting a video format that can be received and decoded by the second terminal and converting the video format of the received video information into the selected video format and means for transmitting the video information having the converted video format to the second terminal.

Thus, as is quite clear from the above, the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 2, 7 and 8 provides for an exchange between terminals as coordinated by a multi-media conversion server wherein the server gets a destination from data transmitted from a first terminal and obtains information

regarding the capability of the second terminal which is the destination of the information. The capabilities of the second terminal could, for example, include information regarding the video format that can be decoded and received by a terminal or information regarding the screen size of video information that can be received and decoded by the second terminal. The advantages of these features of the present invention as recited in claims 2, 7 and 8 can be found in the specification on page 11, lines 14-19. Therein, it describes that a transmission terminal can transmit video and speech files to a receiving terminal without being aware of the processing capability of the receiving terminal.

Sahai simply discloses a system in which packet switched multi-media data streaming is controlled based on the capabilities of a client and the preferences of the user. As taught by Sahai, a server processor, coupled to the client processor over a packet switch network, receives client processor capabilities in association with a request for service and such information is used by the server so as to supply information from the server to the client.

However, as is quite clear from the above and the teachings in Sahai that each switching device performs the allocation of data as described in col. 4, lines 32-40 by obtaining the capabilities of a plurality of clients from the clients as described in col. 3, lines 9-10 of Sahai. Thus, in Sahai each terminals informs their own capability to a server and receives data depending on the capability as has been expressed by the terminal itself to the server.

The present invention differs substantially from that taught by Sahai being that according to the present invention, the multi-media conversion server is intended to

coordinate transmission between a transmitting terminal and a destination terminal. Thus, according to the present invention, the multi-media conversion server obtains the media decoding capabilities of the destination terminal so as to convert any transmissions from the transmitting terminal to the destination terminal according to the capabilities of the destination terminal. This teaching of the present invention provides an advantage over conventional apparatus in that the destination terminal need not have the intelligence necessary to inform other apparatus of its capabilities. Such features are clearly not taught or suggested by Sahai.

Thus, Sahai fails to teach or suggest a multi-media conversion server including means for receiving media information transmitted by a first terminal, means for acquiring a destination of the media information received and means for acquiring media decoding capability of the second terminal which is the destination as recited in the claims.

Further, Sahai fails to teach or suggest means for converting the media information into media information corresponding to the media decoding capability of the second terminal and means for transmitting the media information corresponding to the media decoding capability of the second terminal to the second terminal as recited in the claims.

Therefore, as is quite clear from the above, the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Sahai whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 2, 7 and 8 as being anticipated by Sahai.

Claims 5 and 6 were amended so as to more clearly describe that the present invention is directed to a multi-media conversion server including means for receiving character information addressed to a second terminal by a first terminal, means for acquiring format information that can be received and decoded by the second terminal, speech signal conversion means for converting the character information into a speech signal, video signal synthesis means for synthesizing a video signal corresponding to the speech signal into a synthesized video stream, speech signal encoding means for encoding the speech signal using the first information, video encoding means for encoding the video signal using the format information into an encoded speech stream, means for adding encoded speech stream and the synthesized video stream to the character information and sending such streams to the second terminal and means for presenting a plurality of speech types to be converted and a plurality of video types to synthesized and instructing to select and specify each one type from among the speech and video types to the first terminal.

According to the present invention, the speech signal conversion means converts the character information into a speech signal of the selected speech type and the video synthesis means synthesizes the video signal into the selected video type.

Thus, the present invention allows for particular speech types and video types to be selected and allows for the character information to be converted into the selected speech type and the video signal to be synthesized into the selected video

type. Such features are clearly not taught or suggested by any of the references of record particularly Chen.

Chen discloses an intelligent alerting system that receives a notification or indication of an abnormal condition and alerts end users via one or more devices including one or more enhanced performance reproduction devices such as an enhanced television or an enhanced radio. As taught in Chen, the intelligent alert system performs data conversion in response to enhanced performance reproduction devices as discussed, for example, in col. 6, lines 33-53 and that the communication format converter 130 determines conversion format as taught in col. 6, lines 40-53 thereof.

However, at no point is there any teaching or suggestion in Chen that the first terminal can select a particular type of speech or video for transmission as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

Thus, Chen fails to teach or suggest means for presenting a plurality of speech types to be converted and a plurality of video types to be synthesized and instructing to select and specify each type from among the speech and video types to the first terminal as recited in the claims.

Further, Chen fails to teach or suggest that the speech signal conversion means converts the character information into a speech signal of the selected speech type and the video synthesis means synthesizes the video signal into the selected video type as recited in the claims.

Therefore, as is quite clear from the above, the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 5 and 6 are not taught or suggested

by Chen whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claims 5 and 6 as being anticipated by Chen is respectfully requested.

As indicated above, the present Amendment adds new claims 11 and 12. New claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 6 and therefore recite the same features recited in claim 6 shown above not to be taught or suggested by Chen whether taken individually or in combination with any of the other references of record.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claims 1-10.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 2 and 5-12 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 2 and 5-12 is respectfully requested.



To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (520.40577X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Carl I. Brundidge  
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc  
(703) 684-1120